

Payne, Sharon

From: Lee, Kyung
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2005 8:32 AM
To: Payne, Sharon
Subject: RE: 10/707,566--restriction

For claims 1 and 9, 200/5A (multiple switches with independent operator) seems to be proper.

KL

-----Original Message-----

From: Payne, Sharon
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2005 8:23 AM
To: Lee, Kyung
Subject: RE: 10/707,566--restriction

Kyung,

What subclass do you suggest for claims 1-9?

Sharon Payne

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Kyung
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2005 3:07 PM
To: Payne, Sharon
Subject: RE: 10/707,566--restriction

Sharon,

Claim 9 seems to recite similar structures as those structures recited in claims 1, 7 and 8 (dependent). If you are planning to restrict, I believe claims 1-9 should be included in Group 1. Claims 1-9 are broad enough to be examined in class 200. Nonetheless, I am not familiar with claims 10-34 to suggest proper grouping.

Good luck.

KL

-----Original Message-----

From: Payne, Sharon
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2005 9:51 AM
To: Lee, Kyung
Subject: 10/707,566--restriction

Kyung,

I am interested in doing a restriction, and it appears that claim 9 pertains to class 200 and not 362. The proposed groupings are as follows:

Group I--claims 1-8 and 10-17;
Group II--claim 9
Group III--claims 18-34.

Please advise as to whether I am correct. If claim 9 does not fit in class 200, please indicate what art unit I should consult with next. If you think a different set of groupings is more appropriate, please notify me.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sharon Payne